REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application; and in the Office Action, the Examiner issued a final rejection of these claims both over the prior art and under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. With respect to the rejection of the claims over the prior art, Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,199,077 (Inala, et al.), and Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Inala, et al in view of U.S. Patent application publication no. 2002/0049833 (Kikinis).

Claims 1 and 10 are being amended to include features from Claims 4 and 16 respectively. Editorial changes are being made to Claim 4 to keep the language of this claim consistent with the language of Claim 1. Claim 6 is being amended to describe apparatus features analogous to the method steps being added to Claims 1 and 9, and minor editorial corrections are being made to Claims 6 and 16. Also, Applicants herein ask that Claim 1 be amended to overcome the rejection of Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112. The rejection of Claims 6-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is respectfully traversed, however.

For the reasons advanced below, Claims 1-16 are clear and definite and also patentably distinguish over the prior art. The Examiner is, accordingly, asked to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102, 103 and 112, and to allow these claims.

With regard to the rejection of the claims as being indefinite, the Examiner, in the Office Action, argued that there was insufficient antecedent basis in the claims for the limitation "reaching said pointer in said template." The Examiner further noted that this was

because in the independent claims 1, 6 and 10, the phrase "a position to the macro class" should be "a pointer to the macro class."

Applicant notes that this informality occurs in Claim 1, but not in Claims 6 or 10.

As for Claim 1, this opportunity is being taken to correct the informality in Claim 1, and, specifically, to change "position" to "pointer." It is respectfully submitted that this change overcomes the indefiniteness in Claim 1 and Claims 2-5 and 14, which are dependent from Claim 1.

As for Claims 6 and 10, Claim 6 presently describes the feature that "a pointer to the macro class is embedded in the template," and Claim 10 currently describes "a pointer" embedded in the template. Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 6 and 10, and the claims that are dependent thereon, are clear and definite.

In view of the foregoing discussion and changes, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

With respect to the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-16 distinguish over the prior art because that prior art does not disclose or suggest the way in which the templates and macros re used, as described in independent Claims 1, 6 and 10, and in particular, the way in which the templates and macros work together to control the processing flow.

It is important to emphasize that the present invention is not simply using a template that includes text, but instead is directed toward processing test files by using templates and macros together in a specific way. The primary references relied on by the Examiner, Inala, et al. and Kikinis, disclose procedures that use text, but they are not about processing text files in the manner of the present invention.

Inala, et al. and Kikinis are principally directed to HTML or some other means of Web presentations. Although these references use terms such as "templates" and "macros," these features are not used in the prior art in the same way that they are used in the present invention.

Specifically, the Examiner cites a fairly long section of the Inala patent, which does mention templates and scripts. The description of the structure of the templates is not very specific in the Inala patent; however, it is clear that these templates are not fragments of text from a text file. For example, the description of a template found in Inala beginning at column 11, line 45 says that it is made up of location and label descriptions. This clearly does not sound like fragments of literal text from a text file. Since the templates are outputs of scripting module (see column 12, lines 35-40), it would appear that these templates are prototypes of scripts. Therefore, what is disclosed in Inala is very different from the present invention.

The present invention, in contrast, processes text files used to communicate between applications or between an application and an end user. As discussed in detail in the present application, there are three important problems in text file processing. One problem is how to describe the program for the structure of the text file, and another problem is mapping data between the text file and the application. A third problem is how to describe the flow of control needed to process the file.

This invention effectively addresses all three of these problems by means of interrelated use of templates and macros. Specifically, the first above-described problem is solved by forming the templates so that they have literal fragments of the text file. These templates are then used as overlays for parsing the text file into segments, or as prototypes to

generate segments of output files. The second problem – mapping data from the text file to the application -is solved by the use of specialized macro classes. For example, input macros are provided to read in a segment of the text file and to use that segment to initiate application update processing.

The third problem - flow control - is addressed by the nested interaction of templates and macros. A macro – or, more precisely, a pointer to the template – is stored as a keyword in the template. During the parsing of the text file, when that pointer is reached, the pointer is used to invoke the macro, and the macro is used to map data from one of the segments of the text file to the computer application. The macro, in turn, may call for another template to further parse the text file, and this second template may call other macros.

The present invention distinguishes over the prior art not because the present invention uses templates and macros, but because of the way in which the templates and macros are used and the way in which the templates and macros work together to control the processing flow.

Kikinis, for example, in paragraphs 13 and 14 refer to "creating a list of parameters" and "storing the parameters as a template" (in paragraph 13) and then (in paragraph 14) "The template comprises one or more parameters derived from the characteristics of the client device." It should be quite evident to one with even a minimal familiarity with the art that what is descried here is very different from the templates of the present invention. The templates of the present invention comprise text fragment with places to "fill in the blanks," and which are pointers to processing macros. What Kikinis is describing is nothing of the sort.

It is noted that Kikinis refers to "script. Presumably, however, the references to a script in Kikinis (paragraphs 17-22), are references to a "Mark-Script." The only similarity between this feature of Kikinis and the present invention is that both have some means to invoke computer processing. Since, as mentioned above, the templates described in Kikinis are not the same as the templates of the present invention, then there is no possibility that an interaction with the templates of Kikinis via a script could be the same as the interaction of templates and macros that happens in the present invention.

Applicants herein ask that Claims 1, 6 and 10 be amended to better describe this nested interrelationship between the templates and the macros. Specifically, Claims 1 and 10 are being amended to describe the feature that the macro class, after being invoked by the template, then invoked a nest template to further process the text file. Claim 6 is being amended to describe analogous apparatus limitations.

The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest the above-discussed nested interrelationship of templates and macros, and the way in which the templates and macros function together to process a text file. Inala, et al. discloses templates, but the templates are not used to invoke macros that are then used to invoke another template. Kikinis also discloses scripts, but these scripts are not used to map data from one of the segments of the text file, as segmented by the template, to the computer application.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and they too, whether they are considered individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest using a template/macro class combination in the manner described in Claims 1, 6 and 10.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 6 and 10 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims 1, 6 and 10 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 and 14 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1. Similarly, Claims 7-9 and 15 are dependent from Claim 6 and are allowable therewith, and Claims 11-13 and 16 are dependent from Claim 10 and are allowable therewith.

It is noted that the requested amendments to Claims 1, 10 only add to these claims features already described in Claims 4 and 16 respectively. In particular, both Claims 4 and 16 describe the feature that the macro class invokes a next or another template to further process the text file, and this feature is being added to Claims 1 and 10 as a positive step. In addition, the last Office Action was the first time that the Examiner applied Inala, et al, and it is believed that Applicants should have an opportunity to respond to this new reference. It is thus believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, and to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112. The Examiner is also requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow Claims 1-16.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy